

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-captioned patent application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action to which the Amendment is responsive. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,990,106 (Szegda) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,802,738 (Henningsen). Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0032422 (Montena) (incorrectly referred to as Szegda) in view of Henningsen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,879,102 (Horak). Claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 are rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Montena in view of Henningsen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,511,137 (sic 6,511,337 "Fandrey"). Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montena and Henningsen in view of Fandrey and further in view of Horak. Claims 5 and 12 have been objected to, but the Examiner has indicated that they contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. For the reasons set forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amended claims and the following discussion.

In order to anticipate under the Statute, each and every essentially claimed limitation must be found in the single cited reference. Those limitations that are not found must be notoriously well known to one of sufficient skill in the field.

In order to raise a "prima facie" obviousness rejection, each and every claimed limitation must also be present in the cited art, either singly or in combination, at the time of the invention to one of sufficient (e.g., ordinary) skill in the field of the invention. Those features that are not found or suggested must be very well known to those of ordinary skill in the field.

The present inventive device is directed to a compression connector for connecting a hardline coaxial cable to an equipment port that comprises a front and rear body members detachably coupled to each other by an integral coupling nut

retained on the rear body member. As discussed in the background of the invention section of the specification, hardline cables have substantial differences in size, composition and performance characteristics from flexible coaxial cable used in drop cables. Consequently, not all structures and mechanisms utilized in a drop cable connections are directly transferable to hardline cable connections, and vice versa. One problem common to many hardline connectors is that it is not possible to disconnect the cable from line equipment, such as taps and amplifiers, to test the equipment without breaking a good connection between the cable and the connector body. Often, in order to ensure adequate cable retention and electrical connection upon reconnection of the cable, it is the standard practice to cut and re-prepare the end of the coaxial cable, which shortens the cable over time to the point where additional cable needs to be spliced to the line.

The uniqueness of the subject coupler design for a hardline connector lies in the ability for the rear body member to remain permanently attached to the outer conductor of the cable while still permitting detachment and reattachment of the cable and connector from an equipment port.

With respect to the rejections of the claims, Henningsen was used as a reference in combination with one to three other patents to support each of the rejections. However, the structure of the Henningsen connector does not permit separation of threaded connection between the bushing or collar 2 from the main body 1 without adversely affecting the compression connection of the slotted tube 3 and ferrule 4 with the outer conductor of the cable which are tightened upon the threaded advancement of the bushing. In order to clarify this capability, an additional clause has been added to the final element of Claim 1 and Claim 8 to clarify the intended use of the product whereby the front body can be detached from the coupler nut without adversely affecting the connection between the cable and the back body.

Additionally, it is noted that under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), the Montena application (2005/0032422) is commonly assigned with the subject application to

John Mezzalingua Associates, Inc. of East Syracuse, NY, and therefore cannot be used as a 102 (e), (f) or (g) prior art reference to reject the pending claims.

While Fandrey (assuming the Examiner was referring to U.S. Patent No. 6,511,337) does utilize a thrust washer (156) between a threaded sleeve 144 and an elastomeric boot 150 that is molded onto the multiple wires, it does not teach the use of a thrust bearing disposed between the ridge on the inside of a coupler nut and a shoulder on the mandrel of a coaxial cable connector as presently claimed. Therefore, Fandrey's use of a thrust washer is not properly combinable with the remaining references to render the claims unpatentable.

Furthermore, in making such obviousness rejections, the Examiner has failed to point to any teaching or suggestion in the art to combine the references. Indeed, Szegda and the Montena application relate to drop connectors for flexible cable, which are relatively inexpensive and are often simply cut off the cable and discarded. Moreover, such drop connectors do not have front bodies, insulators, collets or guides as required by the claims of the subject application. Henningsen and Horak, on the other hand, relate to hardline connectors for rigid or semi-rigid cables with solid outer conductors. Neither of these references for hardline connectors suggests the feature of the claimed invention that utilizes an integral coupler nut to permit the detachment of the front body from the back body without adversely affecting the connection with the cable as the advancement of the threaded back bodies cause the compression of the slotted ferrules against the solid outer conductor. The combinations applying certain features of a hardline connector to drop connectors are particularly suspect without a motivation to combine the references. Consequently, the rejections appear to be based only on impermissible hindsight gleaned from applicant's own disclosure.

In summary, Applicant submits that the pending claims, as amended, are now in an allowable condition and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/771,899
Amendment Dated: July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 12, 2005


Atty. Docket No.: 205_035
Express Mail Label No. EV554214127US

If the Examiner wishes to expedite disposition of the above-captioned patent application, he is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Respectfully submitted,

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP

By: 
James R. Muldoon
Reg. No. 38,249

JRM/jeb
Telephone: (315) 425-9000

Customer No.: 20874